

The Journal of Academic Librarianship. 1982, vol.7.n.6. p.351-357.

ISSN: 0099-1333 (Print) 1879-1999 (Online)

<http://www.elsevier.com>

http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/620207/description#description

©1982 Journal of Academic Librarianship.

Evaluating Undergraduate Library Instruction at The Ohio State University

by Penelope Pearson and Virginia Tiefel

As a large-scale Library Instruction Program (LIP) was implemented, it was evaluated at each stage by means of questionnaires. Data derived from the questionnaires helped change the content of the LIP lectures, the type of materials distributed to the students, and the format of the exercises. It also evaluated the success the program had in reaching incoming students and in giving them experience in using library tools. Separate surveys also showed that students retained their skills after a period of time, improved their attitudes toward the library, and increased their use of the library resources. LIP's success has led to the development of course-related instruction for upper level students.

This is the second of two articles discussing the development, implementation, and evaluation of The Ohio State University Libraries' Library Instruction Program (LIP), designed to teach basic library skills to all entering freshmen, approximately 8,600 in a typical fall term.

The first article *LIP Service* published in the November 1981 issue of *JAL* focuses on the development and implementation of LIP as the first phase of a comprehensive program for user education at Ohio State. Discussed at length are the program's goals and objectives, the development of the lecture content and supporting audiovisual materials, and the library exercises. Results of a pilot testing of these materials are presented. Attention is given also to the mechanics of the initial implementation of LIP in Fall 1978, involving 70 academic instructors, five undergraduate librarians, and 23 volunteering librarians in the teaching of the 198 class sessions within a seven-week period.

Purpose of This Article

The need for evaluation of library instruction programs has been addressed repeatedly in the literature. Major areas of concern expressed about evaluation include the difficulty in measuring effectiveness of undergraduate library instruction in large institutions,¹ the lack of standards by which to compare evaluation results,² and the lack, in general, of scientifically and statistically valid studies of library instruction programs.³ In developing LIP, the undergraduate librarians recognized these difficulties and found themselves in agreement with Johnson's position that "individual design for evaluation does not have to be perfect, [but] needs to return significantly better information for making a decision than would be available through guess and gut feeling."⁴ Accordingly, incorporated into the planning of LIP from its implementation was a student questionnaire designed to collect the data necessary for determining what revisions should be considered for the program. A similar questionnaire to be administered to section instructors was prepared in order to elicit their reactions to the program.

Presented here are the results of evaluation following the initial implementation of LIP in Fall 1978 and in three subsequent academic terms. Standard library use measures (reference questions asked, reshelving of reference materials and periodicals) also are presented as indicators

of the program's impact. The findings of an independently administered campus telephone survey are discussed in order to provide another perspective on the program. The place of LIP in the projected three phase library instruction program for undergraduates and LIP's role in promoting the importance of library instruction and library use to the University's Task Force on Learning and the teaching faculty are outlined.

Program Review

LIP's content was changed several times in the academic terms following its implementation in Fall 1978. A brief review of these changes will be helpful before focusing in greater depth on the evaluations and the specific revisions generated by those evaluations.

The Fall 1978 instruction and exercise focused strictly on instruction in the use of the card catalog and *Reader's Guide*. Previous observations at reference desks and the results of a Spring 1978 pilot program indicated that most entering freshmen lacked sufficient skills to use these two most basic library resources. A general discussion of the OSU library system and the Library Control System (LCS), OSU's computerized circulation system being developed into an online catalog, was also included in the lecture content, but not covered in the written exercise required of the students. However, both students and advisors responding to early questionnaires indicated that the exercise was too basic and repetitive of previous (1st e , pre-OSU) library instruction. Therefore, the exercise used Winter-Spring-Summer 1979 was revised to include required use of subject specialized encyclopedias/dictionaries, *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, the card catalog, periodical indexes (focusing more on the *Social Sciences Index* and *Education Index*), biographical sources, book review sources, and hands-on use of LCS.

The increased difficulty and scope of the exercise required additional class time for discussion of these materials, a full class hour was needed as compared to a 20-minute presentation used in the Fall 1978 program. Reactions to the changes were very positive, but as the exercise required more time in the library for its completion and students continued to earn the same point value credit for completing the assignment, the University College (UVC) administration requested that the exercise be shortened to relate more closely the time necessary for completion to the credit awarded. Accordingly, sections on biographical and book review sources were deleted, leaving the subject encyclopedias/dictionaries, *LC* subject headings, card catalog, periodical indexes, and LCS.

Evaluation Distribution and Rate of Return

Essentially the same student evaluation questionnaire was used each term, some revisions were made in the format originally used in Fall 1978.⁵ A similar evaluation questionnaire was distributed to the instructors each term.

Table 1 illustrates the rate of return of questionnaires for each term Fall 1978, Winter 1979, and Spring 1979 evaluations were distributed to all students completing a library exercise. Evaluations were sent to the advisors with the graded library exercises. Advisors were asked to distribute an evaluation to each student and to emphasize the importance the librarians placed upon the student evaluation of the program. The evaluations were collected by the advisors and returned to the librarians by campus mail. For Fall 1979, a sample of students was selected (One class

section for each of UVC's designated areas was selected as representative). A total of 18 class sections was chosen representing 8 percent of the total UVC enrollment. Librarians visited these 18 sections and distributed evaluations randomly by giving an evaluation to each alternate student entering the class section. Again the advisors collected the evaluations and forwarded them to the librarians. Of the 575 evaluations distributed, 462, or 80 percent (equaling approximately 5 percent of the total UVC enrollment), were returned.

The student evaluation questionnaire was designed to provide four types of information:

1. previous library instruction and previous use of OSU libraries
2. opinions and suggestions regarding the lecture and materials
3. testing of information retention
4. attitudes toward libraries

Previous Library Instruction and Use of OSU Libraries

Table 2 outlines information obtained about student's previous library instruction. Clearly, much of the planned lecture content and therefore the skills required to complete the exercise had been obtained through previous library instruction. The accuracy of students' responses to the test questions in the evaluation and their requests for more detail and more challenging work also confirmed this finding.

While the library exercise required students to use one of the two OSU undergraduate libraries, students were asked to indicate what other OSU libraries they had also used during the term. The main library was listed by 23 to 33 percent of the students in each term. Many students also visited department libraries, accounting for 12 to 25 percent of responses over the first year. Only 3 to 6 percent of the students reported use of no libraries other than the undergraduate libraries. With a system as decentralized and geographically dispersed as OSU's—with a main library, two undergraduate facilities, and 23 department libraries—the fact that *entering* freshmen reported use of libraries other than the two undergraduate libraries suggests that the Library Instruction Program was instrumental in acquainting freshmen with the number and diversity of libraries and library services available and had influenced them to make use of these libraries.

Opinions and Suggestions about the Lecture and Materials

Students were asked to rank the usefulness of the variety of information provided in the lecture and printed material they were given. Fall 1978 students ranked instruction in *Readers' Guide*, information about LCS, and specific information on the West Campus Learning Resources Center as the three most helpful elements. In the following terms the three items always listed as most helpful were general information on the OSU Libraries, specific information on the West Campus LRC,⁶ and general information on LCS, although the order of importance of these items varied with each term. In the Fall 1978 program, students had received a two-page informational handout which briefly gave the locations, hours of operation, and services of each undergraduate library, as well as a short descriptive paragraph on LCS. In response to questioning (about suggestions for improvements to the library instruction), students requested more printed materials and more detailed information on each undergraduate library, and on LCS. A single sheet handout on each undergraduate library, giving its address, hours of opening, a description of basic services, and a floor plan already existed as part of general informational displays in each facility. The handout originally prepared for the program was discarded and these separate sheets on each

library were reproduced in quantity. A specially printed brochure providing both a description of LCS and instructions on its use was distributed in each class with the library handouts. Evaluations from Winter 1979 showed that students preferred the more detailed, printed information. The materials have proven very successful in acquainting students with the location and layout of both facilities, a decrease in the number of directional questions asked at the reference desks and the receipt of very few requests for additional printed information during subsequent terms appears also to be a direct consequence of the program.

Students were asked to comment on the quality of the lecture presentation. The organization of the lecture and use of transparencies were felt to be effective by 37 percent of the Fall 1978 students. However, 13 percent stated that they had had difficulty hearing the presentation, 32 percent did not understand the presentation or did not find it helpful, and 15 percent indicated that it was one of the worst lectures they had heard all term. While these responses were disappointing, they were instrumental in causing the lecture content and teaching methods to be revised and ultimately led to a significant improvement in the quality of the lectures. For Winter 1979 lectures, the explanation of the card catalog and illustrations of catalog cards were shortened with emphasis placed on the concept of the divided card catalog in the undergraduate libraries and an introduction to *Library of Congress Subject Headings*. The importance of transcribing the complete call number (the item most frequently in error on the evaluation test question in Fall 1978) and a quick explanation of the difference between LC and Dewey classification numbers were emphasized when illustrating a sample card. Discussion of periodical indexes focused on the similarity between *Readers' Guide* and various subject-specific indexes, with only a quick review of the citation format and its interpretation. Librarians attempted to discuss only those aspects of a particular resource which specifically related to its use in the library exercise, emphasizing to the students the importance of attention to the lecture content for the work required to complete the required exercise.

Table 1
Evaluation Distribution and Return*

Quarter	Papers Graded	Evaluations Distributed	Evaluations Return	Rate of Return
Fall 1978	6,624†	6,624	3,985	60%
Winter 1979	552	552	279	50
Spring 1979	310	310	68	22
Fall 1979		575	462	80

*Evaluations were not distributed during the Summer 1979 program as all previous evaluation responses had been consistent and plans to shorten the exercise per UVC request were to become effective in the following quarter

†Although enrollment totalled 8,600, approximately 7,200 attended a library instruction lecture, 6,624 library exercises were graded

Table 2
Previous Library Instruction

Method of Instruction	Fall 1978	Winter 1979	Spring 1979	Fall 1979
From a Librarian in School or Public Library	45%	52%	53%	56%
From a Teacher	25	19	19	26
Never	7	15	12	12
Other*	18	13	15	7
No Response	4	2	0	0

*Included Family, friends, previous college, self-taught

Table 3
Periodical Test Question Results

Question	Fall 1978	Winter 1979	Spring 1979	Fall 1979
Page Numbers				
Correct	67%	69%	81%	80%
Incorrect	19	2	4	3
No response	14	29	15	17
Date of Publication				
Correct	65%	76%	84%	81%
Incorrect	16	1	2	4
No response	18	24	15	15

Table 4
Call Number Test Results

Question	Fall 1978	Winter 1979	Spring 1979	Fall 1979
Call Number				
Correct	73%	66%	79%	66%
Incorrect	20	22	11	24
No response	7	12	10	10

Evaluations from Winter term 1979 showed that 65 percent (up 33 percent from Fall 1978) of the students felt the presentation was well organized and the transparencies helpful, only 7 percent (down from 13 percent) reported difficulty hearing and 22 percent (down from 47 percent) expressed negative reactions. While the percentage of negative responses indicated that improvements could still be made, the higher rate of positive reactions was encouraging. The question regarding lecture presentation was deleted from the evaluation as of Fall 1979, results from the OSU Poll, however, which will be discussed in detail later, continued to indicate that students found the lecture presentation effective. Moving the library lecture from the classroom to the library or providing library tours was often included in the suggested improvements. The size of the student group and individual class size, however, made this unworkable. As an alternative, the exercises used in Winter 1979 were rewritten, the multiple-choice question format was

discarded in favor of a narrative combination walking tour/exercise. This revision provided the student an opportunity to explore the physical layout and location of important services and resources, as well as giving descriptive instructions on the use of materials required in the exercise. Students' success in completing the exercise, the marked decrease in directional questions asked at the reference desk, and students' retention of the information as tested in the questionnaire administered at term's end, strongly suggest that the exercise revision was effective.

Testing of Information Retention

Three test questions were included in the student questionnaire to measure retention of information on interpretation of citations in periodical indexes and catalog card information content. A sample periodical citation was provided and two questions required students to identify a specific element (page numbers and date) from the citation. The rate of correct responses on both questions was very high, as shown in Table 3.

Results of the test question requiring identification of a call number from a sample card are outlined in Table 4. Although the percentage of correct responses was encouraging, the variety of incorrect answers suggested that students did not understand the concept of the call number or know where to locate it on a catalog card. Most frequently, a response was incorrect because the student had copied only the first line of the call number, had thought the second line was the call number, or had omitted the letters indicating the first element of LC classification. However, many students also selected other sets of numbers appearing on the catalog card, e g, LC catalog card number, or preprinted Dewey and LC classification numbers printed at the bottom of the card.

Attitudes

Students were asked to express their attitudes toward libraries and toward their UVC library instruction (see Table 5). Of the ten questions asked, the six on general library attitudes were developed by Larry Hardesty,⁷ the remaining four (#10, 13, 15 18) were prepared by the OSU undergraduate librarians and focused specifically on LIP. The general questions revealed that students found the OSU Libraries to be comfortable places to work, were not awed by the library, did not go to the library only when required to complete assignments, generally spent more time in the library than they had planned, and viewed the libraries as not only a place for study but as a place to seek information to complete course assignments. Students expressed no hesitation about asking a reference librarian for help, but generally felt the librarian could help only if the student knew what help was needed. Students recognized the UVC library instruction as only a beginning and felt that they would need more help to use the libraries with greater effectiveness. Expressions of confidence in their ability to use the card catalog and periodical indexes were mixed among the Fall 1978 students, emphasis by librarians on individualized attention in the libraries, however, contributed to increased student confidence in subsequent terms.

Expansion of the LIP lecture to a full class period, the use of an exercise which required students to employ more challenging and diversified materials, and stronger emphasis on hands-on use of LCS required students to make greater use of library resources and thereby, made students more aware of the scope and variety of resources available to them.

Table 5 Attitude Questions

Questions	Fall 1978	Winter 1979	Spring 1979	Fall 1979
# 9 I find a library a very comfortable place to work when I need to go there.				
Strongly agree/agree	42%	90%	88%	deleted
Undecided	17	7	2	
Disagree/strongly disagree	37	2	6	
No response	4	7	4	
#10 Even after the library instruction in my UVC 100 class I need help to find information in OSU Libs.				
Strongly agree/agree	40%	58%	54%	51%
Undecided	16	18	21	18
Disagree/strongly disagree	40	22	19	25
No response	4	2	6	5
#11 Walking into a library is like going into a church.				
Strongly agree/agree	37%	18%	20%	deleted
Undecided	15	22	18	
Disagree/strongly disagree	43	58	59	
No response	4	3	5	
#12 I only go to a library when someone makes me go.				
Strongly agree/agree	27%	4%	9%	deleted
Undecided	17	7	6	
Disagree/strongly disagree	51	87	78	
No response	5	3	7	
#13 I feel confident I can use a card catalog.				
Strongly agree/agree	47%	83%	81%	83%
Undecided	17	13	12	11
Disagree/strongly disagree	31	4	2	5
No response	5	1	6	4

	Fall 1978	Winter 1979	Spring 1979	Fall 1979
#14 When I go to a library I often spend more time than I planned because I find so many interesting things.				
Strongly agree/agree	41%	44%	49%	deleted
Undecided	17	29	25	
Disagree/strongly disagree	37	26	22	
No response	5	1	4	
#15 I feel confident that I can use <i>Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature</i> to find magazine articles for my assignments.				
Strongly agree/agree	32%	75%	78%	76%
Undecided	23	20	13	13
Disagree/strongly disagree	41	5	3	6
No response	5	1	6	5
#16 A person should only ask librarians for help when it looks like they aren't busy				
Strongly agree/agree	26%	10%	7%	deleted
Undecided	19	5	4	
Disagree/strongly disagree	50	84	84	
No response	5	1	4	
#17 Normally a librarian can only help you when you know what you are looking for.				
Strongly agree/agree	41%	29%	25%	deleted
Undecided	22	14	12	
Disagree/strongly disagree	31	56	59	
No response	5	1	4	
#18 I expect to use OSU Libraries for studying only, as none of my courses will require research				
Strongly agree/agree	47%	9%	6%	9%
Undecided	20	14	10	26
Disagree/strongly disagree	29	73	78	60
No response	4	4	6	5

LIP experienced continuous student and instructor evaluation which was used in making significant changes in the program's content, materials, and lecture. Classroom evaluations furnished insights into student attitudes toward libraries, provided some measure of student abilities, and helped to highlight the program's strengths and weaknesses.

LIP's impact may also be seen in a review of standard library counts—reference questions asked and reshelving of reference materials and periodicals. With the first full implementation of the program in Fall 1978, use of Fall 1977 statistics as a base offers some interesting comparative information. In Fall 1977, the reference question count was 1,554 at the West Campus Learning Resources Center (WCLRC) and 644 at the Sullivant Hall Undergraduate Library (SHUL) (See Table 6). This increased to 2,355 (by 52 percent) at the WCLRC in 1978 and to 3,775 (by another 61 percent) in 1979—an increase of 143 percent over two years—without any significant change

in the user population. The SHUL provides similar data, from 644 questions in Fall 1977 to 936 in 1978, and to 1,226 in 1979—an increase of 90 percent. The *annual* reference count increased 35 percent from 1978 to 1979 at the WCLRC and 14 percent at the SHUL,⁸ this is especially significant when compared to the much smaller increase (2 percent) in the number of reference questions asked at departmental libraries.

Table 6
Reference Questions—Fall Quarter

	1977	1978	1979	Comp 1977-79
WCLRC	1,554	2,355 (+52%)	3,775 (+61%)	(+143%)
SHUL	644	936 (+45%)	1,226* (+31%)	(+ 90%)

*Reference librarian resigned October 1 resulting in reduced service

Perhaps as significant as the increase in reference activity is the increased usage of reference materials and periodicals. This is evidenced in the reshelving counts kept by the SHUL. Monthly figures show a 30 percent increase in October 1979 and a 53 percent increase in November 1979, each from that month in 1978. The fall quarter statistics show a 13 percent increase from 1977 to 1978 and an impressive 84 percent from 1978 to 1979. Students using the undergraduate libraries also are asking for indexes other than the *Readers' Guide*, and previously little-used periodical indexes are being used more frequently.

OSU Poll Results

Additional information on the program's impact has been provided by a review of the Ohio State University Poll (OSUP) results. The poll is an independent survey organization of the Behavioral Sciences Laboratory, OSU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences OSUP surveys, by telephone, approximately 400 OSU students and 200 faculty each autumn, winter, and spring term. Respondents are randomly selected from the university population and results are subject to a sampling error of 4.9 percent for the students surveyed.

The Fall 1979 Poll indicated that 27 percent of the total student body had received library instruction that term and 73 percent had not, 76 percent of the freshman had received library instruction (In as much as the poll was conducted in the middle of the term before the completion of the LIP effort, it was assumed this percentage would be higher by the end of Fall quarter). The Winter 1979 Poll substantiated that coverage of the freshman class was actually much higher, 97 percent of the freshman polled said they had received library instruction in UVC 100. Of the University College students surveyed, 93 percent had been reached through UVC 100 while 56 percent of the entire student body polled had received library instruction through UVC 100.

The Fall 1979 Poll indicated that with a 60 percent response from the University College students, 57 percent (10 percent "extremely," 16 percent "highly," and 31 percent "moderately") were satisfied with the instruction they had received and 2 percent were not satisfied. With a 91 percent UVC response in the Winter 1979 Poll, 75 percent (7 percent "extremely," 28 percent "highly," and 40 percent "moderately") were satisfied and 16 percent were not satisfied.

When analyzed by class, the Fall 1979 Poll showed a 75 percent freshman response with 74

percent (10 percent "extremely," 25 percent "highly," and 39 percent "moderately") satisfied and 1 percent not satisfied. The Winter 1979 Poll, with 97 percent freshman response, indicated 82 percent (8 percent "extremely," 27 percent "highly," and 47 percent "moderately") were satisfied and 14 percent were not satisfied.

The Poll asked students, "Which research skill do you consider to be the most important for students in your subject area to know?" and listed five responses—how to (1) use a laboratory, (2) use a computer, (3) use a library, (4) develop own collection, (5) use some other skill. Of all those interviewed, 47 percent said the library was the most important research skill. Analyzing the response by those who had had library instruction and those who had not, 57 percent of the former and 43 percent of the latter chose the library. Analyzing the response by college or department, University College was second with 54 percent choosing library, only Law students rated library skills first at a higher rate UVC was followed by Graduate School (49 percent), Education (48 percent), Administrative Science and Medicine tied (at 47 percent), all other departments were lower.

In asking which category of library staff students consult most often, the choices offered were (1) professional librarian, (2) circulation clerk, (3) operator in the Libraries' Telephone Center, (4) computer information center. Of those students who had had library instruction, 30 percent reported consulting the librarian first, compared to 20 percent for those who had not received instruction. Graduate students had the highest percentage selecting a librarian (39.5 percent), followed by the freshmen (37.5 percent).

When the Winter 1979 Poll asked students if the library instruction they had received was useful to them, 80 percent (17 percent "extremely," 28 percent "highly," 35 percent "moderately") found it useful and 13 percent did not. A higher percentage of University College students, however, found library instruction useful. Only two other colleges scored a higher percentage on this question.

To summarize, the Poll confirmed LIP's estimates of the number of students reached by library instruction at Ohio State and the degree of students' satisfaction with that instruction. It also provided convincing evidence that there *is* a relationship between instruction and attitudes toward, and the use of, the library. Library instruction appeared to influence from whom students seek help and to affect the importance students attach to the acquisition of library skills. University College students, with LIP experience, scored high in both of these categories.

Future and Related Programs

With Phase I of the projected multiphase undergraduate program in place, OSU librarians began planning Phase II, mindful that "a single exposure to library instruction is [not] enough (even if it is course-related) but in large schools it may be impossible to do otherwise for students."⁹ The OSU librarians agreed that a single effort at instruction is inadequate, but they believe that additional library instruction is possible—even at a university the size of Ohio State.

Phases II and III

The goals and objectives of Phase II are an expansion and extension of those set in Phase I. These include (1) an amplification of the search strategy concept, (2) development of information evaluation skills, (3) the use of more reference materials, and (4) greater coverage of *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, bibliographies, book reviews, biographical indexes, and statistical

sources. Also, the automated circulation system (LCS) portion of the workbook describes the system in detail and requires that students do a number of searches at the terminals.

Phase II is being implemented through the freshman English course, English 110, which, like UVC 100, is required of all entering freshmen (only those testing out of English 110 will be excluded). English 110 is a one-term freshman English composition course in which expository writing is taught using essays and the student's own writings. The course is offered every term and freshmen may take it at any time during their first year at Ohio State.

A self-paced workbook with library assignments is the format chosen for instruction in Phase II. The program is being pilot-tested in three class sections during Spring 1980, plans are to test it over four terms, with Spring 1981 the target date for full implementation. All program planning has been done with the full support and cooperation of both the Director and Associate Director of the Writing Program from the faculty of the English Department.

Each portion of the workbook, which has been prepared by a committee of four OSU librarians, explains how the material included is related to the concept of a search strategy, and worksheets require use of the material in that framework. Thus, students are to learn not only about specific library resources but are to build their own search strategy.

With Phase I of LIP firmly established and Phase II underway, the OSU librarians are beginning development of Phase III. This will be offered at the sophomore/junior level through individual OSU colleges and academic departments. Because instruction in Phase III is course and assignment related, its goals and objectives will vary depending on the course and discipline.

Faculty Seminars

LIP's impact has reached beyond the UVC program in ways totally unforeseen by the undergraduate librarians. LIP attracted the interest and support of a prestigious university task force, which led to the sponsoring of a faculty seminar on library instruction. The seminar resulted in the inclusion of course-related instruction in several upper level undergraduate and graduate courses and has led to the implementation of three new library programs for faculty and graduate students.

In 1979 the Task Force on Learning, a university-wide committee appointed by and reporting to the provost and responsible for improving the quality of education at Ohio State, became interested in LIP. Members of the task force invited the Director of Library User Education to discuss its development and proposed that the library offer a faculty seminar focusing on bibliographic instruction. They supported the seminar with \$1,600 in funding.

The seminar, which was given in Spring 1980, was so enthusiastically received that it will be offered annually. It drew 75 faculty members from a variety of disciplines. Within a few days after the seminar, eight faculty had requested assistance in combining library instruction with their course syllabi,¹⁰ three of the revised courses were taught in Fall 1980.¹¹

The success of the faculty seminar encouraged the library staff to implement two new instructional programs in the 1980 fall term—one a seminar for new faculty and the other a workshop for UVC advisors who are also graduate students. Fifty-five faculty attended the seminar, which was a general introduction to the library system and included a segment on bibliographic instruction. In that same quarter, several UVC advisors, having participated in LIP, requested a library instruction workshop for graduate students. The library's Research Consultant taught the workshop, which, with the new faculty seminar, will become a permanent component of the User Education Program.

Conclusion

Well aware of the difficulty in conducting valid evaluations of library programs, the Ohio State University undergraduate librarians nonetheless were insistent that LIP be evaluated on a continuous basis. Evaluations were seen as necessary to provide data to design and implement changes in the program. In addition, these data furnished insights into students' attitudes toward libraries and provided some gauge of students' abilities. LIP's effectiveness has been examined through standard library statistics and the findings of an independent campus poll. The ripple effect of its success has led to the implementation of new library programs.

As it has been from the beginning, the ultimate goal of Ohio State's multiphase undergraduate library instruction program is to provide students with the library knowledge and skills they will need to identify, use, and evaluate information sources throughout their adult lives.

References

¹Allan J Dyson, "Library Instruction A Column of Opinion," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4, no 3 (July 1978) 160.

²Beverly P Lynch, "Library Instruction A Column of Opinion," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4, no 3 (July 1978) 160.

³John Lubans, Jr, "Evaluation Attempts of Library Use Instruction Programs at the University of Colorado Libraries," in *Evaluating Library Use Instruction*, ed R Beeler (Ann Arbor, MI Pierian Press, 1975), p 67.

⁴Richard R Johnson, "Library Instruction the Mythology of Evaluation," in *Evaluating Library Use Instruction*, p 32.

⁵A copy of the evaluation form is available from the authors.

⁶Eighty percent of entering freshmen take all their classes on the West Campus, accounting for their need for more information on the West Campus LRC.

⁷James Martindale and Larry Hardesty, *Library Service Enhancement Program, Depauw University, Grant Proposal and Quarterly Report* (Greencastle, Indiana Depauw University, October 18, 1977).

⁸

⁸ Reference Questions Annual

	1977-78	1978-79
WLRC	2 432	3,279 (+35%)
SHUL	2 082	2,379 (+14%)
Avg of Dept Libraries		+ 2%

⁹Stuart W Miller, "Library Use Instruction in Selected American Colleges," *University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science Occasional Papers*, no 134 (August 1978) 30.

¹⁰The disciplines involved are agriculture, anthropology, Black studies, communication, history, journalism, medicine, and natural resources.

¹¹These were communication, history, and journalism courses reaching approximately 300 undergraduates.